UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,237	08/22/2006	Makoto Soyama	Q96620	6912
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 07/29/201 ON, PLLC	1	EXAM	INER
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800			LEE, DORIS L	
	J GTON, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2011	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Astion Comments	10/590,237	SOYAMA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	DORIS LEE	1764			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. rely filed the mailing date of this coorsists U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 A	uaust 2010				
· <u> </u>	action is non-final.				
<i>'</i> = <i>'</i> -	, <del></del>				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
olocod in accordance with the practice and in	in parte adayle, rees c.s. 11, 16	.o o.a. 210.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 9-14 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 9-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl	` '		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Parer No(s)/Mail Date 08032010.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/590,237 Page 2

Art Unit: 1764

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 3, 2010 has been entered.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

**Regarding claim 1**, the limitation "the ratio of the average particle size of the peak corresponding to the particle size distribution of larger particles to the average particle size of the peak corresponding to the particle size distribution of smaller particles is less than 8.0" does not appear to have support in the specification. The issue is with the numerical value "8.0". Applicants point to Figure 5, Fly Ash 8 for

Art Unit: 1764

support, however, from this figure, it is difficult to discern the appropriate peak values for the two particle sizes. If the examiner estimates the peak values, the larger particle size appears to have a peak value of 10 microns and the smaller particle size has a value of 1 micron. Therefore the ratio is 10 which does not read on the claimed invention which states that the value needs to be less than 8.0.

**Regarding claims 5-7, 9 and 10-14**, these claims are rejected for being dependent on a previously rejected claim.

# Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, filed August 3, 2010, with respect to Huang I, Goodwin and Kulkarni have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 103 rejections of Office Action mailed on March 3, 2010 have been withdrawn. Kulkarni no longer reads on the particle size distribution of the claimed invention.

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DORIS LEE whose telephone number is (571)270-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 am to 5 pm and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571)272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/590,237 Page 4

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Doris L Lee/ Examiner, Art Unit 1764